arXiv:1603.05426v1 [cs.FL] 17 Mar 2016

A Short Note on Infinite Union/Intersection of Omega Regular Languages *

Wanwei Liu
School of Computer Science
National University of Defense Technology
Changsha, China, 410073

1 A Basic Observation

The most impressive non-star-free property, first pointed out by Wolper [Wol83], "p holds at every even moment" (we in what follows refer to it as $\mathsf{P}(2)$) cannot be expressed by any LTL [Pnu77] formula. As a consequence, numerous extensions or LTL have been presented, such as ETL [VW94], QLTL [SVW87], RLTL [LS07], linear-time μTL [BB87] etc, and all of them are known to be as expressive as (nondeterministic) Büchi automata [Büc62], alternatively, ω-regular languages.

Indeed, $\mathscr{L}(\mathsf{P}(2)) = \bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathscr{L}(\mathsf{X}^{2k}p)$, and this indicates that star-free languages are not closed under infinite intersection. It naturally enlightens us to make one step ahead, and now the question of interest is:

"Are ω-regular languages closed under infinite union/intersection?"

For this, we just consider the language $\bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathscr{L}(\mathsf{P}(k))$, which consists of all ω-words along which p holds periodically.

Theorem 1 *The language $\bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathscr{L}(\mathsf{P}(k))$ is not ω-regular.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that this language is ω-regular, then there is a nondeterministic Büchi automaton $\mathcal{A}$ precisely recognizing it. Namely, each ω-word being of the form $(p;\neg p^k)^\omega$ must belong to $\mathscr{L}(\mathcal{A})$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

W.o.l.g., suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ has n states, and let us fix some $m > n+1$, then $\mathcal{A}$ has an accepting run over the word $w = (p;\neg p^m)^\omega$, say $\sigma(0), \sigma(1), \ldots$

From the Pumping lemma, for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a pair (i, j), s.t. $0 < i < j < m+1$, and $\sigma(t\times(m+1)+i) = \sigma(t\times(m+1)+j)$. This implies that, for each ℓ, the word

$$[(p\cdot\neg p^{i-1})\cdot(\neg p)^{(j-i)\times\ell}\cdot(\neg p)^{m-j}]\cdot(p\cdot\neg p^m)^\omega$$

*The author would thank Normann Decker, Daniel Thoma, Fu Song, Lei Song & Lijun Zhang for the fruitful discussions on this problem.

is also acceptable by $\mathcal{A}$ with the run

$$\sigma(0), \sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(i), \underbrace{\sigma(i+1), \ldots, \sigma(j) = \sigma(i), \ldots, \sigma(i+1), \ldots, \sigma(j)}_{\ell \text{ times}}, \sigma(j+1), \ldots$$

which is definitely accepting.

Likewise and stepwise, we may obtain a sequence of omega words as followings:

- $w_0 = (p \cdot \neg p^m)^\omega$.
- $w_1 = (p \cdot \neg p^{L_1}) \cdot (p \cdot \neg p^m)^\omega$.
- $w_2 = (p \cdot \neg p^{L_1}) \cdot (p \cdot \neg p^{L_2}) \cdot (p \cdot \neg p^m)^\omega$.
- $\cdots$

where $L_1 < L_2 < L_3 < \cdots$

Then, $\mathcal{A}$ also has an accepting run on the limit of the sequence

$$w_\infty = (p \cdot \neg p^{L_1}) \cdot (p \cdot \neg p^{L_2}) \cdot (p \cdot \neg p^{L_3}) \cdot \ldots.$$

thus we can conclude that $w_\infty \in \mathscr{L}(\mathcal{A})$.

However, w_∞ could not have a "period" on p — because, for every number k, there must exist some $L_c > k$ — this implies that the distance between two adjacent occurrences of p will be larger than k in the future.

Thus, we have got a contradiction[1], and it lies from the assumption that $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathscr{L}(\mathsf{P}(k))$ is regular. □

Observe that each $\mathscr{L}(\mathsf{P}(k))$ is regular, but it is not the case for the union of all such languages, and hence regular languages are not closed under infinite union and/or intersection.

2 Adding Step Variables and Quantifiers?

As a possible solution of expressing the aforementioned property, one may orthogonally add *step variables* as well *step quantifiers* in temporal logics involving next operator (X). In a (closed) formula, a step variable is introduced by a quantifier and appears associated with a next operator.

Syntax and semantics of such kind of extensions can be naturally and succinctly obtained w.r.t. the underlying logics. As an example, let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of propositions, and let $\mathcal{K}$ be the collection of all step variables, formulae (in PNF, ranging over f, g, etc) of LTL with such features can be described by the following abstract grammar.

$$f ::= \top \mid \bot \mid p \mid \neg p \mid f \wedge f \mid f \vee f \mid \mathsf{X}f \mid \mathsf{X}^k f \mid f \mathsf{U} f \mid f \mathsf{R} f \mid \exists k.f \mid \forall k.f$$

[1] Remind that an ω-word $w \in \mathscr{L}(\mathcal{A})$ iff p rises periodically along w.

where $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and $k \in \mathcal{K}$. The *satisfaction* ($\models$) of a formula can be defined w.r.t. an ω-word $\pi \in (2^{\mathcal{P}})^{\omega}$, a position $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and a valuation $v : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{N}$. Most cases are defined as routine, and

- $\pi, i, v \models \mathsf{X}^k f$ iff $\pi, i + v(k), v \models f$.
- $\pi, i, v \models \exists k.f$ (resp. $\pi, i, v \models \forall k.f$) iff $\pi, i, v[k/n] \models f$ for some (resp. for every) $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

One can, of course, choose linear μTL as the base logic[2]. Henceforth, we obtain formulae like

$$\forall k.\mathsf{X}^k\mathsf{X}^k p \qquad \text{and} \qquad \exists k.\nu Z.(p \wedge \mathsf{X}^k Z).$$

Actually, the former is just $\mathsf{P}(2)$, and the latter precisely describes the property "p occurs periodically" — which is not an ω-regular property.

3 On Decidability of Such Extensions

Although adding step variables and step quantifiers to logics seems to be a natural and succinct solution, we in this section reveal an inadequate feature of this mechanism — the SATISFIABILITY problem, even if for the "core fragment" given by

$$f ::= \bot \mid \top \mid p \mid \neg p \mid f \wedge f \mid f \vee f \mid \mathsf{X}f \mid \mathsf{X}^k f \mid \exists k.f \mid \forall k.f$$

is not decidable!

But before giving the proof, let us define some syntactic sugars:

- We respectively abbreviate $\underbrace{\mathsf{X}\ldots\mathsf{X}f}_{n \text{ times}}$ and $\underbrace{\mathsf{X}^k\ldots\mathsf{X}^k f}_{n \text{ times}}$ as $\mathsf{X}^n f$ and $\mathsf{X}^{n\cdot k} f$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathcal{K}$.
- We sometimes directly write $\mathsf{X}^{t_1}\mathsf{X}^{t_2} f$ as $\mathsf{X}^{t_1+t_2} f$, provided that each t_i is of the form $(\sum_j n_j \cdot k_j) + n$, where n and each n_j are natural numbers and each each $k_i \in \mathcal{K}$.

Note that in this setting, both the addition ($+$) and the multiplication ($\cdot$) are communicative and associative. Meanwhile, "$\cdot$" is distributive w.r.t. "$+$", namely, $t_1 \cdot t_2 + t_1 \cdot t_3$ can be rewritten as $t_1 \cdot (t_2 + t_3)$.

Moreover, for convenience, when f is a formula involving no free variable, we directly write $\pi, i, v \models f$ as $\pi, i \models f$. Further, we write $\pi \models f$ (resp. $\pi, v \models f$) in place of $\pi, i \models f$ (resp. $\pi, i, v \models f$) in the case of $i = 0$.

Theorem 2 *The* SATISFIABILITY *problem of the core logic is not decidable.*

[2] Note that to define semantics of such an extension, another valuation from $\mathcal{Z}$ to $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ is also required, where $\mathcal{Z}$ is the set consisting of all predicate variables.

PROOF. The main observation is that "each formula of Peano arithmetic[3] has a peer expression in this fragment, and they are of the same satisfiability".

To show this, we need to build the following predicates:

1. Fix a proposition $p \in \mathcal{P}$, and let $L_p \triangleq \forall k_1.\forall k_2.\neg\forall k_3.(\mathsf{X}^{k_1+k_3}p \leftrightarrow \mathsf{X}^{k_1+k_2+k_3+1}p)$.

   Actually, L_p just depicts the "*non-shifting property*" of p. i.e., if $\pi \models L_p$ then for each $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i < j$, there is some t having: either "$\pi, i+t \models p$ and $\pi, j+t \not\models p$" or "$\pi, i+t \not\models p$ and $\pi, j+t \models p$". (Just view k_1 as i and view $k_1 + k_2 + 1$ as j.)

2. Let $L_=(k_1, k_2) \triangleq L_p \wedge \forall k.(\mathsf{X}^{k_1+k}p \leftrightarrow \mathsf{X}^{k_2+k}p)$.

   Hence, $\pi, i, v \models L_=(k_1, k_2)$ iff $v(k_1) = v(k_2)$.

3. Let $L_<(k_1, k_2) \triangleq \exists k.L_=(k_1 + k + 1, k_2)$.

   Clearly, $\pi, i, v \models L_<(k_1, k_2)$ iff $v(k_1) < v(k_2)$.

4. Subsequently, we use $L_+(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ to denote $L_=(k_1 + k_2, k_3)$.

   According to the definition, $\pi, i, v \models L_+(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ iff $v(k_1 + k_2) = v(k_3)$.

5. Now, let us fix another proposition $q \in \mathcal{P}$ and define

$$\begin{array}{rcl} L_q & \triangleq & q \wedge \mathsf{X}q \wedge \forall k_1.\exists k_2.\mathsf{X}^{k_1+k_2}q \wedge \\ & & \forall k_1.\forall k_2.\forall k_3.(\mathsf{X}^{k_1}q \wedge \mathsf{X}^{k_2}q \wedge \mathsf{X}^{k_3}q \\ & & \wedge L_<(k_1, k_2) \wedge L_<(k_2, k_3) \\ & & \wedge\forall k_4.(L_<(k_1, k_4) \wedge L_<(k_4, k_2) \vee L_<(k_2, k_4) \wedge L_<(k_4, k_3) \rightarrow \neg\mathsf{X}^{k_4}q) \\ & & \rightarrow \exists k_5.\exists k_6.(L_+(k_5, k_1, k_2) \wedge L_+(k_6, k_2, k_3) \wedge L_+(2, k_5, k_6))) \end{array}$$

   We may assert that $\pi, i \models L_q$ iff i is a complete square number (i.e., $i = j^2$ for some j). Let us explain : The first line indicates that q holds infinitely often, and it holds at the positions of 0 and 1. For every three adjacent positions k_1, k_2, k_3 at which q holds (hence, q does not hold between k_1 and k_2, nor between k_2 and k_3), we have $|k_3 - k_2| = 2 + |k_2 - k_1|$. Inductively, we can show that q becomes true only at 0, 1, 4, ..., $(n-1)^2$, n^2, $(n+1)^2$, ... (The encoding of L_q is enlightened by [Sch10].)

6. We let

   $$L_2(k_1, k_2) \triangleq L_q \wedge \mathsf{X}^{k_2}q \wedge \mathsf{X}^{k_2+2\cdot k_1+1}q \wedge \neg\exists k_3.(L_<(k_2, k_3) \wedge L_<(k_3, 2\cdot k_1 + k_2 + 1) \wedge \mathsf{X}^{k_3}q)$$

   then we have that $\pi, v \models L_2(k_1, k_2)$ iff $v(k_2) = (v(k_1))^2$.

7. As the last step, we define that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} L_\times(k_1, k_2, k_3) & \triangleq & \exists k_4.\exists k_5.\exists k_6.(L_2(k_1, k_4) \wedge L_2(k_2, k_5) \\ & & \wedge L_2(k_1 + k_2, k_6) \wedge L_=(k_4 + k_5 + 2 \cdot k_3, k_6)) \end{array}$$

[3]Peano arithmetic is just a fragment of first order logic, with the signature consisting of naturals, the function $+$, $\times$ (respectively be interpreted as addition and multiplication), and the predicate $<$ (whose canonical interpretation is "less than"). cf. [Pea89].

Then in the case of $\pi, i, v \models L_\times(k_1, k_2, k_3)$, we may get the following constraints:

$$\begin{cases} v(k_4) &= (v(k_1))^2 \\ v(k_5) &= (v(k_2))^2 \\ v(k_6) &= (v(k_1) + v(k_2))^2 \\ v(k_6) &= v(k_4) + v(k_5) + 2 \times v(k_3) \end{cases}$$

and we subsequently have $v(k_3) = v(k_1) \times v(k_2)$.

Now, we can see that "addition", "multiplication", and the "less than" relation over natural numbers can be encoded in terms of the core logic. Since quantifiers are also involved here, then the SATISFIABILITY problem of Peano arithmetic can be reduced to that of the core logic — the former is known to be undecidable (cf. [Göd31, Chu36]). □

4 Further Discussions

As we have seen, to gain the expressiveness of infinite union/intersection of (a family of) regular languages, an admissible approach is to cooperate with step variables and quantifiers in the logic — however, it suffers from the undecidability of SATISFIABILITY.

To tackle this, we need to investigate new mechanisms — it should both enhance the expressiveness and keep the logic decidable. So far, we are not aware of it, and it seems that employing more powerful existing automata, say pushdown automata, is also not feasible.

References

[BB87] B. Banieqbal and H. Barringer. Temporal logic with fixed points. In *B. Banieqbal, H. Barringer, and A. Pnueli, editors, Temporal Logic in Specification*, volume 398 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 62–74. Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[Büc62] J.R. Büchi. On a decision method in restricted second order arithmetic. In *Proc. Int. Congr. Method and Philosophy of Science 1960*, pages 1–12, Palo Alto, CA, USA, 1962. Stanford University Press.

[Chu36] A. Church. A note on the Entscheidungsproblem. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 1:101–102, 1936.

[Göd31] K. Gödel. Über formal unentscheidbare sätze der principia mathematica und verwandter system, I. *Monatshefte für Methematik und Physik*, 38:173–198, 1931.

[LS07] M. Leucker and C. Sánchez. Regular linear temporal logic. In *Proceedings of the 4th international conference on Theoretical aspects of computing*,

volume 4711 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 291–305. Springer-Verlag, 2007.

[Pea89] G. Peano. *Arithmetices principia, nova methodo, exposita,*. Bocca, Torino, 1889.

[Pnu77] A. Pnueli. The temporal logic of programs. In *Proc. of 18th IEEE Symposium on Foundation of Computer Science (FOCS' 77)*, pages 46–57. IEEE Computer Society, 1977.

[Sch10] N. Schweikardt. On the expressive power of monadic least fixed point logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 350(2–3):1123–1135, 2010.

[SVW87] A. P. Sistla, M. Y. Vardi, and P. Wolper. The complementation problem for Büchi automata with applications to temporal logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 49:217–237, 1987.

[VW94] M. Y. Vardi and P. Wolper. Reasoning about infinite computations. *Information and Computation*, 115(1):1–37, November 1994.

[Wol83] P. Wolper. Temporal logic can be more expressive. *Information and Control*, 56(1–2):72–99, 1983.